## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **1 April 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-9, 11-21, 23-33, and 35-37. Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-9, 11, 12, 13, 18-21, 23, 24, 25, 30-33, and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Gordon (U.S. Patent No. 7,043,701, hereinafter "Gordon"), and Miller (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,358, hereinafter "Miller"), and Jetha et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,661,426, hereinafter "Jetha"). Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 14-16 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Gordon, Miller, Jetha, and DeStefano (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,123, hereinafter "DeStefano"). Examiner rejected claims 5, 17 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Gordon, Miller, Jetha, and Cook et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,822,662 B1, hereinafter "Cook").

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 14-16, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Gordon, Miller, Jetha, and DeStefano. More specifically, Examiner rejected claim 2 (as well as other dependent claims) averring that DeStefano disclosed:

> "projecting a ray from a predefined viewpoint in the 3D display model through the cursor, which is located in a rectangle representing the 2D display in the 3D display model, toward one or more windows in the 3D display model and determining if the ray intersects a window" (see office action, page 6, first paragraph).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. DeStefano is limited to describing an arrangement of "focal planes" for display to a user. DeStefano nowhere describes projecting a ray from a predefined viewpoint through the cursor and toward windows in the 3D display model to determine if the ray intersects a window.

More specifically, in the sections of DeStefano cited in support of Examiner's argument, DeStefano discloses:

> "An abstraction stack functions to display information from one or more focal planes in such a manner that the different focal planes are organized in a three-dimensional workspace such that the relative arrangement of the focal planes is readily apparent therefrom. Focal planes are generally handled as two-dimensional virtual constructs, with the depth vector upon which focal planes are organized representing the third dimension of the stack. As a result, display of an abstraction stack on a two-dimensional display such as a video monitor often requires three-dimensional modeling techniques to be utilized to provide a three-dimensional rendering of an abstraction stack.
>
> Depth manager 60 generally handles the data structure of the abstraction stack as well as rendering of the abstraction stack on a computer display. The data structure of the abstraction stack includes a plurality of objects representing different abstraction stack components. As shown in FIG. 4, a depth vector 62 is provided for the data structure to organize each focal plane, or level of abstraction, for a body of knowledge. Depth vector 62 is principally an organizational construct, and may or may not be displayed on a computer display. Focal planes are organized at predetermined positions along the depth vector, e.g., evenly spaced along the length thereof" (see DeStefano, col. 13, lines 10-33).

Applicant respectfully points out that that cited section of DeStefano describes only the arrangement of focal planes in a three-dimensional workspace. The cited section nowhere describes navigating the abstraction stack. In fact, Destefano is expressly limited to setting lenses and the using the set lenses to view the focal planes (see DeStefano, starting at col. 17, line 39). DeStefano nowhere describes projecting a ray from a predefined viewpoint through the cursor and toward windows in the 3D display model to determine if the ray intersects a window.

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention determine if a cursor overlaps a window within a 3D display model by projecting a ray from a predefined viewpoint in the 3D display model through the cursor, which is located in a rectangle representing a 2D display in the 3D display model, toward one or more windows in the 3D display model and determining if the ray intersects a window (see instant application, par. [0058]).

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention determine if a cursor overlaps a window within a 3D display model by projecting a ray from a predefined viewpoint in the 3D display model through the cursor, which is located in a rectangle representing a 2D display in the 3D display model, toward one or more windows in the 3D display model and determine if the ray intersects a window. These amendments find support par. [0058] of the instant application. No new matter has been added. Applicant has also cancelled claims 2, 14, and 26 without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-9 and 11-12, which depend upon claim 1, claims 15-21 and 23-24, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 27-33 and 35-36 which depend upon claim 35, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

## CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By __/Anthony Jones/_____
Anthony Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 1 July 2008

Anthony P. Jones
Park, Vaughan & Fleming
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com